

## REMARKS

Applicant expressly acknowledges that claims 8-14 have been withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests cancellation of claims 8-14 with the expressly reserved right to file a divisional application with respect to those claims.

The drawings have been objected to for spelling errors and omission of a "Prior Art" label in Fig. 1. To overcome this objection, the Applicant respectfully requests consideration and approval of red-ink drawings enclosed herewith for Figs. 1, 5, 8, 10 and 14. No new matters is added by these changes and their acceptance is respectfully requested.

The Abstract has been objected to for being provided in two paragraphs. Applicant expressly requests entry of an amendment to the specification which provides the Abstract in one paragraph and with minor clarifying revisions. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the Abstract adds no new subject matter and its acceptance is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 has been objected to for several misspellings. Accordingly, the spellings have been corrected and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the patent to Matsumori, U.S. Patent No. 6,179,206. The remaining depending claims 3 and 4 have also been rejected in view of Matsumori as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

It must be remembered that anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the presence in a single prior art reference a disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Connell v. Sears Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548, 220 U.S.P.Q. 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Thus, for an anticipation rejection to stand, all limitations of the claim must be found in the reference or be fully met by it.

Upon review of the Examiner's comments, the cited references, and the application, the Applicant respectfully requests entry of an amendment to independent claim 1 which sets forth an information technology system wherein the S-label includes an RFID storage portion for storing the RFID, a user storage portion for storing data inherent to each S-label,

and an electric wave portion for transmitting data stored in the RFID storage portion and the user storage portion by wireless. The S-label further includes a first controller for controlling the RFID storage portion, the user storage portion, the electric wave transmission portion and the first controller; and a second controller for controlling the RFID storage portion, the user storage portion, the electric wave transmission portion and the second controller, the second controller being connected to the first controller. Basis for this amendment can be found in the drawings and throughout the specification and, in particular, at page 5, lines 13-16.

It is respectfully submitted that providing first and second controllers in the S-label is distinguishable from the cited reference and all other references made of record. In the present invention, while one controller is accessing the RFID storage portion or the user storage portion, the other controller can perform various arithmetic operations. Moreover, the first and second controllers can perform the processings different from each other. And, since the first and second controllers are connected to each other, they can perform the same processing by sharing related functions. In distinct contrast, the Matsumori reference discloses at column 10, line 34 to only use an RFID card. Moreover, there is absolutely no teaching, suggestion or motivation in Matsumori that a specified configuration of the RFID card includes two controllers that can communicate with one another so as to improve the processing of data. It is respectfully submitted that each and every element of the claim is not taught or suggested by Matsumori. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable and that all claims depending therefrom are likewise deemed allowable.

Based upon the foregoing amendments and remarks, claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are believed to be patentable and entry of a formal Notice of Allowance as to those claims is earnestly solicited.

A Request for One-Month Time Extension is attached along with a check in the amount of \$55.00 (small entity). In the event the fee required for the filing of these documents is not enclosed or is deemed insufficient, the Assistant Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to withdraw the required funds from Deposit Account No. 18-0987.

Application No.: 09/727,961  
Amendment dated: February 12, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 22, 2003

Should the Examiner deem a telephone call to be beneficial in resolving any remaining matters or to place the claims in better form for allowance, the same would be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Edward G. Greive, Reg. No. 24,726  
Andrew B. Morton, Reg. No. 37,400  
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber  
First National Tower - Fourth Floor  
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456  
Telephone: (330) 376-1242  
Facsimile: (330) 376-9646  
E-mail: abmorton@rennerkenner.com

Attorney for Applicant(s)

February 12, 2004

**Amendment of the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include proposed red-ink changes to Figs. 1, 5, 8, 10 and 14. These sheets replace the original sheets including Figs. 1, 5, 8, 10 and 14. The proposed changes correct omissions and spelling errors contained in the originally filed drawings. It is submitted that no new subject is added by these changes and acceptance of the proposed drawings is requested.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets